THEOLOGY

VOL. XLVIII JUNE, 1945 No. 300

Editorial Note

IT will be apparent that Mr Milford's sermon was preached several months ago, but it is particularly apposite now. It is impossible to put Christian teaching about forgiveness in a nutshell or in a simple proposition. This is a moment when all that the Scriptures say about it must be marked and pondered and brought to bear on the witness of the Church and on the policy of statesmen. There is reason to hope that on this occasion the crude vituperation which accompanied the notorious Coupon Election after the last war will not be repeated, and also that there will not be a subsequent reaction to sentimental idealism. But we cannot be sure. It is always easy to become ruthless when we are contemplating accumulations of evil, and sentimental when we are contemplating unspeakable suffering. And maybe it is easier still for those who contemplate these things from a distance to affect a cynical detachment. We are doubtless more aware of these perils than we were after the last war, but we can hardly be aware enough. It has often been said that the strain of the post-war period is likely to be more exacting than that of the war itself. It is well to have said it, but that will not by itself have made us ready to bear the strain or to resist the downward drag of war weariness. Truly, this is a time for more intent watching, as well as for more intense praying.

Can We Forgive?[1]

All things are of God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ, and gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses, and having committed unto us the ministry of reconciliation. We are ambassadors therefore on behalf of Christ, as though God were intreating by us: we beseech you on behalf of Christ, be ye reconciled to God.—2 Cor. v, 18 *ff.*

CHRISTIAN forgiveness is the reflection in the Christian's life of the love of God. And whether it is easy or hard, whether it is psychologically possible or as it seems impossible, for Christians there can be no other standard than that we should love as God loves. It was our Lord Himself who said, "Be ye perfect, as your Father in heaven is perfect," or in St Luke's version, stressing the point which is also given by the context in St Matthew, "Be ye merciful, as your Father in heaven

[1] A sermon preached in the University Church of St Mary the Virgin, Oxford, on November 19, 1944.

is merciful." And our answer to the question, "Ought Christians to forgive?" is "Yes, as God forgives." How then does God forgive?

God's Moral Indifference.—He causes His sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain upon the just and unjust. He is kind toward the unthankful and the evil. Yes, it is true, there is a love in God which is apparently quite indifferent to moral considerations: an all-embracing charity which gives and gives and gives, without conditions. This is our Lord's answer to one of the problems of the Old Testament, which having learnt that God is righteous could not understand why He did not favour the righteous, as any righteous man, according to men's notions, would. St Paul's phrase for the same thing in *Romans* is "longsuffering." Even the powers which evil men misuse come from Him. He does not favour the good man's crops; he does not blast the soil of Japan or turn the Germans' petrol to water in the tanks of flying bombs. That is just why, to many men, it seems there is no point in loving God; He gives us all we want, whether we love Him or not, so why worry? The Christian who counts upon the steadfast love of God, and the pagan who trusts in the unvarying constancy of nature, will do many of the same things, and get many of the same results. To the one it will be a constant cause for thankfulness "for our creation, preservation and all the blessings of this life"; and to the other a proof that sin is a fiction, or at any rate does not matter.

In this respect, as Christians, we are called to love as God loves. "Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you, bless them that curse you, pray for them that despitefully use you . . . and ye shall be sons of the most High, for he is kind towards the unthankful and the evil." That is the very reason why our Lord commands us to love our enemies. If we do this, there are two results which surprise or even confound us; unreasonably, however, if they follow from imitating God. First, we shall find that the enemy very often thinks that we are mugs and takes advantage of us again and again. That is to be expected; we ourselves do the same to God, except when we remember we are Christians. Secondly, we shall find ourselves allied in some of our actions with those who do really believe that business is business, and after all you have got to trade with the enemy some time (you are in the same world with him after all) and might as well begin when the going is good.

This general, all-embracing love of God is the background of all else, and it must be in us, as in Him, unconditional. It means that in so far as Christians have an influence in public affairs, such as conditions of peace, we must recognize that all people, including our enemies, must live; and the economic structure, which is built upon nothing else than God's all-embracing love mediated through nature, must aim indifferently at serving the good of all, without any reference to "desert." This incidentally is economic common sense, as we might expect, and one of the failures of Versailles was that it tried to be juster than God. It means, further, that Christians are called to works of mercy without any distinction save that of need. A good example of this was European Student Relief after the last war, which later turned into I.S.S. Its fundamental principle was that members of all creeds, political views, and nationalities were equally eligible for its services. It could, as a

body directed by Christians, take no other line, though it was often pressed to discriminate between "good" and "bad" candidates for help. The Red Cross and the whole healing profession have stood for this same principle of indiscriminate service.

God's Justice.—But, of course, this is not the whole story. God's love is righteous, and is necessarily hostile to all evil. This is His "wrath," which is the reward of wickedness. God could not be love if He did not hate evil, as you will know if you have ever loved at all, and seen the person, or even the thing you loved, being ruined. This is not an Old Testament conception which has strayed into the New, nor is it St Paul's invention. It is right in our Lord's teaching too. "Fear him who, having killed, has power to cast into hell." (This may just possibly be Satan, but even so the "power" he has is from God.) There is a sin which has no forgiveness. All our Lord's warnings addressed to the rich, the proud, the unforgiving, depend upon His belief in the righteous will of God, which is bound to work out in the condemnation of the wicked. His weeping over Jerusalem is because He foresees the doom which is hanging over her, because she knew not the day of her visitation. And of those who were massacred by Pilate, and of those on whom the Tower of Siloam fell, He says that they were not sinners above all who dwelt in Jerusalem, "But, except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish," that is, in the fall of the city, when one stone shall not be left upon another, and in the general massacre. In the predictions of the final judgment, which are so puzzling to us, it is clear at least that the historical "judgment" on Jerusalem is a sign of the judgment of God upon the whole course of history; and in this case the instrument of judgment is the Roman Empire reacting against Jewish intransigence according to the operation of the laws governing human communities. These are God's laws, which bring disaster and decay or prosperity and stability according to the degree in which the communities approximate to justice. They work slowly, and at any moment there is a large degree of unredressed injustice; but they work surely, and the final judgment is the assurance that in the end total justice will be done.

God's forgiveness is active.—What then of God's loving forgiveness? Does He not forgive? Most certainly He does. But did you think that forgiveness was just to take no notice of sin and its consequences, or to arrange things so that however badly you behave there are no bad consequences at all? Don't you see that that makes nonsense of everything—if whatever we did we could be sure it would not matter "because God forgives"?

God is always forgiving, because, whatever the sin, He never stops loving the sinner and willing his good. But that forgiveness (or "forgivingness," if it helps you to make the distinction) is thwarted until a means is found to bring the sinner back into the right way. Till then forgiveness is offered but cannot be received.[1] Forgiveness is active love in the special relation of offended to offender, and its end is reconciliation.

[1] "To forgive" is like "to teach." He who will not learn cannot be taught.

"Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and gave his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." . . . "While we were yet enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son." This is the same love of God, who had ever been "holding out his hands to a disobedient and gainsaying people," "who willeth not the death of a sinner, but rather that he may be converted and live." And in the fulness of time (that is, when the way had been prepared) He sent His Son, who said, "I am not come to call the righteous but sinners. The Son of Man is come to seek and to save them that are lost." "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." In these and many other passages we are shown the meaning of God's forgiveness (or forgivingness) actively coming out, coming down, in Christ, "while we were yet sinners," before repentance.

There is much confusion about this. People say "forgiveness is not possible without repentance," and in one sense that is true. But it is taken to mean that we can sit back and wait for repentance and then begin to forgive. That is not God's way. If it had been, there was nothing to add to the Old Testament, which knew that God forgives those who repent. The new thing is that His forgiveness seeks out the sinner, while he is yet in his sin.

This is immensely costly. It meant for Christ a whole life of identification with men still in their sin, the suffering of the consequences of sin which they had committed and He had not; and finally, the death of the Cross. Beyond that comes the Resurrection, the forgiveness of sins, the reconciliation, and newness of life. We have not time to consider the many questions about the Atonement which theologians have tried to understand. But this, we know full well, is the heart of the Gospel. We must go on and try to see what, if all this is true, is our Christian duty towards our enemies.

The Ministry of Judgment.—The disciples are not told that it is their duty to be the instruments of God's judgment on the world. "He sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world should be saved through him." Governments, even heathen governments, *are* said to be the intended instruments of God's justice, like the heathen powers of the Old Testament. That is, the nations, in trying to follow out the law of their life, will execute judgment upon their own criminals and also in the long run on one another. Now the fundamental principle of the life of a nation as such is the principle of self-preservation. And in the pursuit of that principle we and the Americans and the Russians are already doing dreadful things to Germany, and shall do more dreadful things still both to Germany and to Japan. We have seen already in this war a little of the fearful consequences of even temporary defeat, the disintegration not only of the economic structure, but of family life and morals as well. The late Archbishop, with characteristic realism and honesty, changed his mind on this subject when we began our mass bombing of Germany, and said so.[1]

[1] *E.g.*, in his foreword to Stephen Hobhouse's *Christ and Our Enemies*; *cf.* Reinhold Niebuhr in *Christianity and Society*, Fall, 1944.

Whereas he had thought before that a nation acting on Christian principles should punish the aggressor nations, he came to see that the suffering and disintegration preceding and following defeat were so great that it is not for any human will deliberately to add to it. The recognition of this solves another problem. For part of the consequence of sin, and the worst part, is moral disintegration. It must be so, and it is part of God's righteous will that it should be so (as St Paul insisted in Romans i). But though the sinner draws to himself damnation *and* causes the little ones to stumble, still God does not absolutely will his death, but rather that he may be converted and live.

The Ministry of Reconciliation.—What Christians are told to do (it is our duty and our great privilege and should be our joy) is to take up the "ministry of reconciliation" which our Lord has committed to us. "He that would be my disciple, let him take up his cross and follow me." "As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I sent them into the world. And for their sakes I dedicate myself, that they also may be really dedicated." "Simon Peter, lovest thou me? Feed my sheep." (Did not that include seeking and saving the lost?)

Can Christians forgive? Can Christians follow the Master? That is the question. Our calling as Christians is to be "ministers of reconciliation" not between man and man only, but between man and God; to embody in ourselves that active outgoing and forgiving love. If we have not seen this and do not want to do it, we are still outside, alienated from God, we are still in our sins. We are still unforgiven.

This is the one condition which our Lord lays down for being forgiven. "If ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you. But if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses." (He wants to, but cannot.) "And *whensoever* ye stand praying, forgive, if ye have aught against anyone; that your Father which is in heaven may forgive you your trespasses."

Forgiveness is a privilege, the privilege of sharing in the supreme work of God. It is the privilege which is given to those who have suffered wrong, not only who are prepared to suffer, but who have suffered wrong. This gives them the special relation to those who have inflicted the wrong, in which forgiveness works. Ignoring this gives justification for the irritated feeling with which those who have suffered hear comfortable Christians, who do not at any rate seem to have suffered, blandly talking about forgiving all and sundry as if it was the easiest thing in the world. Can *we* forgive the massacres of the Jews? No, we cannot. Not if we stand outside and watch from a distance. Victor Gollancz can, because he is a Jew. Christ can, because in His all-inclusive love He is one with all humanity. ("Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.") His members can, if we get right down as He does, so close to those who suffer wrong that the wrong done to our friends is really done to us. The relatives of those, in some degree, all the fellow-countrymen of those who have been insulted and ill-treated by the Japanese, have a special duty and privilege of forgiveness towards the Japanese for that very reason, and so with others. Missionaries have always known

this. The martyrdom of the pioneers has always been seen as the call for further offers of self-sacrificing service.

This divine forgiveness sees in the sinner's offence a desperate need of help, a symptom of a desperate sickness, an infectious sickness, a sickness unto death. Left to itself, this evil thing will propagate itself; the train of disaster, wickedness, hatred and death will spread and spread. But when it meets forgiveness there is a change, a miraculous change, a new creation. That sinner may be changed, or he may not; he is saved at least from the worst of the consequence of his sin, its evil effect on other people, and somewhere, if not in this life, he may learn to thank God for the salvation which he did not deserve.

Jesus on the Cross prayed, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." There is no reason to limit this prayer to the Roman soldiers. Pilate and the priests did not know they were crucifying the Son of God. Because of this prayer, uttered in the moment of agony, the Cross became a sacrifice for their salvation too. It is preached as the good news to Pharisees, priests and Romans alike. In the *Acts*, Pharisees, Romans and "a multitude of the priests" were converted. Stephen prayed as he was being stoned, "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge." That prayer too was answered, at least in the conversion of Saul, and who can say in how many ways besides? Perhaps forgiveness, the forgiveness which redeems, always begins with prayer. It certainly is impossible without it, and all the other things which it involves are only effective in so far as by prayer they become part of the redeeming work of Christ.

I must add a note on the texts which seem to suggest that Christian forgiveness must wait upon repentance. "If thy brother sin, rebuke him, and if he repent, forgive him. And if he sin against thee seven times in the day, and seven times turn again to thee saying, I repent, thou shalt forgive him." There are other similar sayings, in one of which we are told to show him his fault before two or three, and then before the Church, and if he does not repent to treat him as the gentile and the publican. Note that in each case it is "thy brother." And in close connexion with one of these sayings is the authority given to the disciples to bind and loose. Forgiveness here is a restoration to the fellowship of the Christian community, for which of course repentance is necessary. In relation to its own members the Church must exercise the judgment of Christ, and exclude from its membership those who are clearly refusing to belong to it. You cannot remain in Christian fellowship with such a one, any more than you can be in Christian fellowship with the heathen persecutor while he is what he is. He becomes to you as the gentile and the publican; and the gentile and the publican were the special subjects of Christ's forgiving love. Repentant or unrepentant, they can never be outside yours.

Summary.—Britain and her allies must try to obtain security for themselves and a tolerable place in the world for Germany and Japan. They must rise above bitterness and revenge. In God's world this is common sense, and Christians along with other people of common sense must support it. In the course of the struggle we become inevitably the instruments of judgment and also come under the common judgment on the nations, in that all alike have fallen far below the

requirements of justice. There is no need, and we have no right, to arrogate to ourselves the power to punish.

Governments have the right and duty to prevent or check the progress of sin by the punishment of criminals. This is only effective if it can be done in such a way as to be manifestly just. Whether this can be done in the case of the "war criminals" is a matter for the lawyers. But if it can, according to the New Testament, it ought to be done; and a penitent criminal would wish it to be done to himself.

The Christian as such must never fail in love towards anyone, not even towards the unrepentant criminal. He must always be longing for, and actively seeking, his good.

The Christian, who in himself, or in his friends, has suffered, has a special privilege of forgiveness towards those through whose fault he has suffered. *At least* he will stop the spread of hatred; at the best, he will be instrumental in the conversion of the individual or his fellows in the sin. This is the redemptive love of God in action. If we want to be used in this way, God will show us, and show the Church, how and where it can be done. And if we would help the atonement on behalf of Jews, or any others who have suffered more than ourselves, we shall begin by winning the right, through friendship, of sharing in their suffering and bearing it with them.

T. R. Milford.

Oxford.

The Shape of the Liturgy[1]

It has long been an open secret that the Dacre Press was about to publish an important work on Liturgy by Dom Gregory Dix. Now at last the book is in our hands. If some students were hoping for a definitive standard textbook, the learned author has not seen fit to give it to them. His work, he says, is not a history of the liturgy, although history inevitably occupies a considerable part of it. The book has grown out of a paper read some three years ago to the General Chapter of the Cowley Fathers; and in the expansion and alteration which the rewriting of the original paper necessitated Dom Gregory Dix has aimed at casting his work in a form which would make it interesting and useful to "a less specialized public" and to set his findings before them "in a way reasonably easy for non-specialists to understand." He has succeeded in an eminent degree. The importance of his book lies not least in this success. He who runs may now read. Yet let it be said at once that he who stops and studies will not read the less profitably.

For students of liturgy Dom Gregory's book will be significant for its new method of approach. Earlier generations of scholars have sought diligently to recover what the late Bp Frere termed "the primitive Consecration Prayer." Dom Gregory shows, on the other hand, that

[1] By Dom Gregory Dix, Monk of Nashdom Abbey. Pp. xix.+764. Dacre Press. 45s.

the nucleus of the eucharistic liturgy is not word but act. By Justin Martyr's day the act was already traditional and had assumed "the four-action shape" which it has retained ever since and which stands in marked contrast with "the seven-action shape" recorded by St Paul and the Synoptists. In the eucharistic rite, the bread and the wine, taken separately by the Lord at the Last Supper, are taken *together*; the thanksgivings said over each separately by the Lord are now said as one over both *together*; the breaking of the bread, performed by the Lord before He took the cup, is now done after the one thanksgiving; and lastly the broken bread and the wine, distributed separately by the Lord, are now distributed *together*. This transformation was required by circumstances, and was effected, on its own authority, by a growing Church unconscious of any control by a corpus of New Testament documents. That is an important point. Anglicans, among others, have never fully considered how the history of the New Testament canon, a history unknown to the Reformers of the sixteenth century, affects certain Reformed positions and assumptions concerning the beginnings both of doctrine and practice.

In presenting his picture of eucharistic beginnings, Dom Gregory Dix overworks the *chaburah* theory popularized by Dr Oesterley. There is, indeed, a certain analogy between the Lord with His disciples and a *chaburah*; but that they were a formal *chaburah*, pledged to all the usages of such associations, is more than improbable in the light of Mark vii, 2-13 and Matthew xxiii, 23. The Lord created His own fellowship; and general Jewish usage, as later codified in such a tractate as *Berakoth*, is enough to account for the procedure at the Last Supper and at the primitive eucharist, as we learn of these from St Paul. The case for the accuracy of St Paul's account of the Supper is persuasively stated by Dom Gregory Dix. He is equally persuasive in his argument that the point of the Lord's command lay, not in *Touto poieite* (for He knew that customary Jewish procedure would be observed whenever His followers met at table), but in the phrase *eis tēn emēn anamnēsin*, which imparted a new meaning to the old pattern.

The joining together of the originally separate thanksgivings over the bread and the wine, and the verbal expression of the Lord's new meaning, gave birth to the single "Great Thanksgiving," or eucharistic prayer, which was to grow into the "canon" or "anaphora" of the later liturgies. That the eucharistic prayer should be a "prayer of offering" was inevitable, in view of the sacrificial implications of the language employed by the Lord in speaking of His death. It was possible, however, to conceive of the eucharistic offering in more ways than one; and in the earlier period we observe a diversity both of content and form in liturgical usage. The similarities between the eucharistic prayers of the historic rites, so far from being survivals from a primitive uniformity, as liturgical writers have too often assumed, rather represent a movement in the direction of uniformity, and are produced by cross-influences, copyings and borrowings, the intricacy of which makes them difficult to disentangle. All this complicated material Dom Gregory Dix handles with the dexterity of the master,

and from it reconstructs the broad outline of the development and completion of the "shape," in both East and West.

Not all Dom Gregory Dix's points of detail will be accepted without question. Does Sarapion's *prosēnengkamen*, for instance, necessarily mean that "we *have* offered" the bread and cup before the eucharistic prayer began? In the Greek of this period the aorist is often used in the sense of a completed present. Here it is coupled with a present tense, *kai parakaloumen*, "and we beseech." The same phenomenon appears in the Alexandrian liturgy at the end of the anamnesis, *proethēkamen . . . kai parakaloumen*, where the aorist presumably has a present sense, "we set before thee." Again, whether or not "the use of the preface and sanctus in the eucharistic prayer began in the Alexandrian church at some time before A.D. 230," one hesitates to subscribe to Dom Gregory Dix's derivation of the Jerusalem preface and sanctus from Alexandria for the reason which he proposes. He finds in Cyril of Jerusalem's Catechesis xxiii an acceptance of Origen's interpretation of Isaiah vi, 2, according to which the sanctus-singing seraphim covered, not their own faces, but the Face of God. We cannot be at all certain that Cyril accepted this view, because, in fact, his phrasing is restricted to that of the Septuagint. We do know, however, that at least ten years previously Origen's interpretation had been condemned by that eminent Palestinian, Eusebius of Cæsarea, who states that the seraphim covered *to* (*prosōpon*) *heautōn*. The early Syriac tradition, as represented by Aphraates, is at one with Eusebius. It is possible that the Jerusalem "preface and sanctus" have a different history from that suggested by Dom Gregory Dix, and, indeed, that the "preface" is strictly not a preface at all; but the considerations in favour of an alternative theory would require an article to themselves. With regard to the anaphora of Addai and Mari, concerning which Dom Gregory Dix differs from some remarks made by the present reviewer, the latter would respectfully plead that, by providing for the omission of the phrase "of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ" from the anamnesis, he had (or thought that he had) avoided that "sudden switch" against which Dom Gregory Dix rightly objects. The reviewer would add that he still does not share Dom Gregory Dix's hesitation in rejecting the epiclesis, or "prayer for communion," as an interpolation into this anaphora. In so isolated and conservative a church as that of the Euphrates Valley, the eucharistic prayer might reasonably be supposed to have retained its ancient hymnic form for a longer period than elsewhere.

It is probable that many of the readers of this book will be tempted to concentrate upon the topical and penultimate chapter on "The Reformation and the Anglican Liturgy" and to skim lightly over what precedes it. This temptation must be resisted; for, interesting and important as the penultimate chapter is, his readers will miss the author's points unless they have grasped his theory of the general development and acquainted themselves with his admirable account of the medieval development. The Anglican Reformers, Cranmer no less than any of them, were products of the late medieval period; and their aims and achievements, liturgical as well as doctrinal, cannot be

understood except against the late medieval background. Cranmer's own personal views were dominant throughout the reign of Edward VI. For this reason Dom Gregory Dix presents us with a full and lucid exposé of Cranmer's ideas concerning the eucharist and the ministry. The ineluctable conclusion of this examination is that the substance of Cranmer's eucharistic doctrine was indistinguishable from that of Zwingli, and that, though Cranmer retained the traditional designations of the ministers in his Prayer Books and Ordinals, the designations had ceased to connote, in Cranmer's mind, the traditional ideas. From this it follows that the rite of 1552 is a more accurate expression of Cranmer's eucharistic belief than the rite of 1549, which was no more than an interim liturgy, designed to prepare the way for a communion service from which all traditional ideas of consecration and sacrifice (with the exception of the verbal offering of praise and the sacrifice of "ourselves, our souls and bodies") had been extruded. Dom Gregory Dix's interpretation of Cranmer's liturgies may cause surprise, and even pain, to a number of his Anglican readers; but in the opinion of the reviewer no other interpretation is possible in the light of the evidence, and it may be added that Dom Gregory Dix could have cited several contemporary supporters, one of whom, the Greyfriars Chronicler, neatly describes the rite of 1552 as "the new service of bread and wine." The change made, in 1559, in the administration formulæ of the service of 1552 directed Cranmer's second liturgy away from the strict Zwinglian path. Yet the effect of this change, at the time of its making, was not as great as Dom Gregory Dix appears to suppose. It is true that Edmund Guest, in a letter written to William Cecil in 1566 (not in 1571 as the form of the author's statement might lead the reader to imagine), maintained that belief in a Real Objective Presence was not incompatible with acceptance of Article XXVIII, which he himself had composed. On the other hand, so imperfectly did the Article prove to accommodate Guest's own belief in the Presence, that he wrote again to Cecil, this time in 1571, asking that certain small but important alterations, designed definitely to admit the doctrine which he held, might be made in Article XXVIII, and also objecting against the proposed confirmation, by the Queen, of Article XXIX, which by implication denies a doctrine of Real Objective Presence. Cecil discussed the matter with Parker, who, however, was adamant against concession; and the Articles were both passed by the Convocations and ratified by the Queen. In his first letter, Guest had attempted to cover his position by a significant, yet somewhat disingenuous, reference to the authority of Bp Jewel. Jewel was the directive theologian of early Elizabethan Anglicanism; and Dom Gregory Dix's account of the Elizabethan interpretation of the Communion Service would have been better balanced had he given some attention to Jewel's ideas. Jewel it was who restored the term "consecration" to the Anglican liturgical vocabulary, although the significance which he gave to the term was other than that which it had for adherents of the "Old Religion." "We pronounce the same words of consecration that Christ pronounced," he wrote against Thomas Harding, ". . . we have the element: we join God's word unto it; and

so it is made a Sacrament. Yet, saith Mr Harding, we have no consecration." Harding may have understood Cranmer's prayer in Cranmer's sense; but Jewel's teaching prevailed. Jewel's teaching inspired the official attitude in the case of Robert Johnson; and for those who accept this teaching there are none of the "awkward implications" which Dom Gregory Dix finds in "the permission for reconsecration under one kind alone in the Anglican rite." The re-interpretation of the Anglican rite, begun in Elizabeth's reign, continued under the Carolines, and did not cease with the last revision of 1662. It was inevitable that, with increased knowledge of "the usages in the Primitive Church," to which the first Edwardine Act of Uniformity referred, Anglicans should endeavour to move away from Cranmer's standpoint towards that of the historic liturgies and to reinterpret their rite in ancient terms. In spite of the difficulties presented by the rite itself and by its origin, the reinterpreters have not been wholly unsuccessful. Who now, for instance, would stand with Cranmer and Harding against Jewel in the matter of eucharistic consecration? The practical expedient, popularly known as "The Interim Rite," which attaches the prayer of oblation to that of consecration, and which receives the stern censure of Dom Gregory Dix, does but carry the process of reinterpretation one stage farther along an historic Anglican road.

In so full, and large, a book as this it is impossible for a reviewer to select for consideration more than a few points. Perhaps enough has been said to indicate the learning and richness of the book. It may be that, with the passage of time, some of its statements and theories will have to be modified or recast and others discarded; but this in no way detracts from its value and importance. It is replete with instruction for the professed liturgical student; and the beginner and the casual reader alike may open it in confidence that, unlike all but a few of existing "Introductions," it will teach them the right questions to ask, and, where its own answers are not final, it will suggest the direction in which correct answers are to be sought. *The Shape of the Liturgy* should materially assist the much-to-be-desired reshaping of English liturgical studies.

In conclusion, a word of gratitude and congratulation is due to the Dacre Press for having ventured upon so serious and considerable a publication under war conditions and for producing it in a worthy format.

London. E. C. Ratcliff.

Sunday Morning Service

Few are satisfied with the present arrangement of the "chief" Morning Service. Mattins *or* Holy Communion means that something of devotional value is lost. Anyone who attends both services hears many features repeated, some of them verbatim. Relief is given by the permission of the 1928 Prayer Book to begin Mattins with "O Lord,

open thou our lips" and end with Benedictus, but this does not go far enough.

The structure of Mattins is less satisfying than that of Evensong, since the Te Deum, which expresses the full faith of the Church in terms of praise, precedes the Benedictus, which is pre-Christian in origin, and the Creed, which sets forth the Te Deum in more intellectual form. The link between the Old Testament and the New is provided by the Canticles of Luke ii—note that the Magnificat comes in the right place at Evensong, the Benedictus in the wrong place at Mattins. Both are songs of God's people uttered before the birth of Christ; Nunc Dimittis, on the other hand, rightly follows the Second Lesson.

On the Sunday next before Advent we have a precious relic of the services of the early Church in the lection from Jeremiah read as the Epistle, which suggests a way out of the difficulty.

Let Mattins be a very short introduction to the Eucharist, based on the Old Testament. Begin with "O Lord, open thou our lips." Continue with one or more Psalms, based on the Introits of 1549. Then have an Old Testament Lesson, generally from the Prophets, as in the second-century Church (see Justin's *Apology*, 67), followed by the Benedictus. Have an authorized Lectionary of Old Testament passages, whenever possible leading up to the teaching of the Collect, Epistle, or Gospel. As two New Testament Lessons are to follow, the Second Lesson of Mattins is omitted.

A break of three or four minutes would come here, while the priest and servers are preparing for the Eucharist, if this is thought necessary —it would be simpler for the priest to be vested already, except for the chasuble, if it is used. At this point the Te Deum would be sung on festivals and certain other Sundays, the Athanasian Creed on Trinity Sunday, the Litany in Advent and Lent, the Benedicite on Septuagesima Sunday, and at other times as an alternative to the Te Deum.

The service would last an hour and a quarter if simpler music were chosen and the sermon confined to fifteen minutes. The Old Testament preparation for Christ would be brought before communicants every Sunday. If some worshippers left after the sermon, they would have heard three Scripture readings and a sermon and have sung psalms and hymns. Prayer would have been scantily represented, so it would be best for them not to leave until after the Prayer for the Church. One advantage of such a revision would be that Evensong, except for the opening sentences, would be completely different from Mattins.

This note is not intended to encourage any priest to follow its suggestions without authority, though even this would be better than some manglings of the Prayer Book order or the complete banishment of Mattins.

X.

With much regret we have to record the death of Mr. Charles Williams, who has been a valued contributor to Theology. *R.I.P.*

BOOK REVIEWS

THE NATURE OF METAPHYSICAL THINKING. By Dorothy M. Emmet. Macmillan. 10s. 6d.

This book, which the publishers are to be congratulated on producing at pre-war price and in almost pre-war format, should suffice, with Mr Farrer's *Finite and Infinite*, to show that metaphysics has survived the attacks of the logical positivists. Its author is interested, however, in religion not less than in metaphysics. Hence she considers metaphysics as providing analogies not only for co-ordinating diverse types of experience but also for indicating the reality transcending experience. And in this connexion it is significant that she concentrates on two chief systems—namely, the "revelationism" of Kierkegaard, Barth and the like, and the Thomist *analogia entis*.

Her criticism of the former of these is excellently done; it may be compared with those in Canon Quick's *Gospel of Divine Action* and Mr Fairweather's more recent book *The Word as Truth*. She discerns an affinity between the revelationists and the logical positivists in their denial of metaphysics (p. 130). She expounds the Thomist doctrine more accurately and understandingly than either Mr Fairweather or Dr Edwyn Bevan (in his Gifford lectures on *Symbolism and Belief*), though *ipsum esse subsistens* would perhaps be a more typical Thomist phrase than *ens realissimum* (p. 172). And it is all to the good that the Thomist doctrine should be thoroughly criticized. But, as the author herself says (p. 188), her criticisms rest upon her epistemology, and here she would seem to be over-influenced by Kant and (as anyone who remembers an excellent earlier work of hers might expect) by A. N. Whitehead. She will not even, with Spinoza and Lord Russell, "go so far as to claim structural identity between processes in nature and the intellectual relations between the ideas in which we symbolize them" (p. 95). "It looks rather," she writes, "as though certain structures within certain processes in nature may be projected in a systematically distorted way in our sensory experience and in the intellectual constructions based upon it" (p. 91), though if this is so it is at the least difficult to see how we can ever know it. And it may indeed be suggested that the chief weakness in the two rather obscure chapters dealing with epistemology (ch. ii and iii.) lies in the fact that Miss Emmet so concentrates on the part that she supposes the mind to play in the construction of its object that she never adequately discusses how the mind knows the object when it has been constructed. The real problem about knowledge, as the scholastics saw, is how such a remarkable activity as knowledge should occur at all. For it *is* queer that the mind should be able to get other things inside itself. There may be a better description of knowledge than is given in such Thomist tags as "The mind is able in some way to become everything," "The mind abstracts from the object its intelligible essence," "The object is in the mind by intentional being," and so on, but Miss Emmet never really looks for it and so she never finds it. And, although she considers at length the Thomist doctrine of analogy and, as we have seen, asserts

that analogy presupposes epistemology, she does not pay any attention to the Thomist epistemology, with its distinction between the *objectum quo* and the *objectum quod*, and so the whole discussion is left hanging in the air. It would seem that (as Miss Stebbing said of Eddington) she "has indeed fallen into the error of which Berkeley accused the Newtonians . . . the very common error [which] consists in confusing the conditions of perception with the objects of perception." Knowledge need not mean "decoding" (p. 61), but neither need it mean "working up." And how, on her own theory, can Miss Emmet possibly know all the things that she says on p. 62? Yet how near she comes to the real point when she writes as follows: "The framing of the epistemological problem which starts from conscious mental states, and then asks how you can prove the existence of anything beyond them, is a question *mal posée*. If put in this form, there is no escape from phenomenalism, or subjective idealism, since 'experience' has been defined in terms of subjective states, and the idea of an object transcending them can only be a pure act of faith or the result of an animistic projection" (p. 64). She has indeed a doctrine of analogy, and it corresponds to her epistemology (p. 205). But it makes the transcendent unknowable, even if not unexperienceable. "The transcendent may then be outside our categories; but that does not mean that it is entirely outside our experience. It is the environment in which we live and move and have our being" (*ibid.*).

These criticisms are far from implying a condemnation of Miss Emmet's book. Indeed, I would suggest that she has only just failed to write the book that is needed to restore metaphysics to its rightful place in philosophy. Much gratitude is due for such a thorough and sustained investigation into the validity and nature of metaphysical thought. Some admirable discussions are given on the way; I would instance the protest against Heim's confusing importation into theology of the mathematical term "dimension" (p. 208). It is good that so many important questions should have been so competently raised and so seriously dealt with. But I doubt whether their solution can be found unless one breaks away more sharply than Miss Emmet is prepared to do from the outlook of her teacher Whitehead.

E. L. Mascall.

Lincoln.

Eighteenth Century Piety. By W. K. Lowther Clarke. S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d.

Dr Lowther Clarke is to be doubly congratulated on the circumstances which have made possible the appearance of this book; for as Secretary of S.P.C.K. he has enjoyed the privilege of access to sources of information not hitherto explored, from which the greater part of his volume is constructed, and by the same good fortune he has been able to ensure the publication of his essays even in the stringent conditions of war time. The volume is really a nosegay, gathered from divers sources. One would like to see the author's commonplace books; for surely even the wonder that "one small head could carry all he knew" is doubly wonderful if unaided by such books. Dr Lowther Clarke gives further examples here of the characteristic already familiar

to his readers, his omnivorous reading. Consequently, a good many of the essays are slight; as for example, those on the Church in Crabbe's poems, Mr Brocklehurst of Lowood, Charles Dickens and the Church, and Mrs Ewing and her books; and represent the author's selection of ecclesiastical topics from his recreation reading.

The more solid essays deal with Henry Newman in particular; for the two chapters on his activities constitute the most original and important of the volume. Students of MSS dealing with English church history in the early eighteenth century can hardly have failed to notice letters from Newman (there are several, for example, in Archbishop Wake's papers); but in them he is acting in a ministerial capacity, and little can be inferred of his character and personality. This lack has been supplied by Dr Lowther Clarke, who makes a human being out of a secretary; and it would seem from the information here published that Newman deserves a more extensive monograph. From the publications of S.P.C.K. an attempt is made to estimate various sides of eighteenth-century churchmanship. In the main this estimate confirms the impression that the period has been much maligned. But there is one astonishing feature—the complete absence among S.P.C.K. publications of "any desire to improve the Prayer Book." Mr Elliott Pearson's study of *The Prayer Book Reform Movement in the Eighteenth Century* has shown the number and variety of such endeavours towards revision; and I have found several references to the need for revision in the letters of orthodox bishops. But S.P.C.K. published no works containing even the most modest and moderate suggestions for reform! In another chapter Dr Lowther Clarke adds useful items of information in supplement of Miss M. G. Jones' authoritative survey of *The Charity School Movement in the Eighteenth Century*. His essay on Thomas Bray is neither so full nor so informative as Mr Lydekker's sketch of the same subject, published in 1943 by the Church Historical Society, Philadelphia. The chapter on George Horne, William Jones, and William Stevens is an interesting picture of high churchmanship before the Tractarian revival.

The essays are loosely strung together; and some, for example those on the Homilies, Charles Dickens, and English church life in 1850, belong to eighteenth-century piety only by a latitudinarian extension of the period usually covered by that phrase. But all the chapters are interesting, some are original and important, and Dr Lowther Clarke has done good service in sharing with a wider public the fruits of his reading and familiarity with the archives and publications of the Society to which he has rendered so long and fruitful service as Secretary.

NORMAN SYKES.

OXFORD.

REFORM OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL LAW. By G. B. Bentley. *Theology* Occasional Papers, New Series, No. 8. 1s.

It is to be hoped that all who are concerned with Church Reform will read Mr Bentley's very useful and interesting essay, which brings to light a number of facts not familiar to most people. In particular we may

note the references to Thorndike's treatise on *The Right of the Church in a Christian State*. Thorndike's doctrine is much more applicable to our present circumstances than is Hooker's, and it merits serious consideration to-day. It is also useful to have brought to our notice the evidence collected in the Report of the Archbishops' Committee on Church and State of 1916, a report usually overshadowed by the work of the similar Committee appointed after the rejection of the Revised Prayer Book. In the last part of his paper Mr Bentley discusses the setting up of the Church Assembly and its relation to Convocation. Some will no doubt consider his criticisms of the Assembly overdone, but the discussion is useful and raises some problems which must be faced.

Mr Bentley sums up under three headings the principal reforms which he considers necessary. They are: 1. That canon law should be reinstated as the law of the Church of England; 2. That it should be given a compact and readily ascertainable form; 3. That it should be promulged with unimpeachable synodical authority. Concerning the first and third points little comment is needed. Most people recognize now the harm which was done to ecclesiastical jurisprudence by the abolition of Doctors' Commons, by Parliamentary legislation, and by the activity of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the last century. In one place, however, Mr Bentley appears inconsistent. He regards the King's supremacy as having been usurped by Parliament and he wishes to restore the *status quo*; but elsewhere he suggests that the Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament should examine all canons before they are submitted for the royal assent. In practice the participation of Parliament cannot be excluded. The King can only act on the advice of his ministers and they are responsible to Parliament. It seems futile to attempt to overturn the present constitutional doctrine.

The second of Mr Bentley's proposals, however, raises more problems. He recognizes rightly that an essential preliminary to reform of the law is the creation of a school of canonists, and he agrees that we cannot simply take over the Roman canon law and its principles; but has he fully realized the amount of work that needs to be done? He says in one place: "A careful scrutiny of all the relevant canonical matter will have to be carried out, in order to ascertain which canons and customs still bind, and which have suffered abrogation or derogation by contrary custom or desuetude." We may be permitted to observe that Mr Bentley, like many other people, talks of custom in canon law as a much simpler thing than it is. One has only to study such a book as M. René Wehrlé's *De la coûtume dans le droit canonique* to realize the difficulty of formulating any satisfactory theory of custom. But assuming such a formula to be found, can we picture a body of Anglicans working through the whole medieval canon law and deciding that this canon binds and that does not? Although there are indications that it has been seen, the question has not really been faced in this paper, as to whether a complete and all-embracing code such as the *Codex Iuris Canonici* of 1917 is desirable for the Church of England, and this, to the mind of the present reviewer, stands out more and more as one of the great problems of legal reform.

Eric Kemp.

Pusey House,
Oxford.

Albert Schweitzer: Christian Revolutionary. By George Seaver. James Clarke and Co. 5s.

Dom Bernard Clements in Africa. By George E. F. Laing, African Priest of the Diocese of Accra. S.C.M. Press. 2s. 6d.

It would be hard to conceive two men more different in their understanding and presentation of the Christianity which was for each a loyalty and a guiding overriding all else. Yet upon each of them Africa made its claim, each responded with an unstinted service, and behind the great outward diversity of the ways in which that service took shape there is a community of spirit which makes it natural that these two books should come up for review together.

Both books deserve and will receive a welcome, though they are nearly as different in purpose and manner as the two great pioneer Christians with whom they are concerned. Mr Seaver is giving an interpretation of, which is also to some extent an apologia for, Dr Schweitzer's philosophy of life. Mr Laing, with a most moving devotion and simplicity, writes to bear testimony to the inspiration which African students drew from Dom Bernard Clements and to the love which he awakened in them, a love shared by very many here in England.

To take Mr Laing's book first, it is enough to say that it is a quite simple and direct picture of a life given to Christ in all its largeness of humanity, its humour and devotion, and its underlying self-denial. It is a picture that will be welcomed by many who to-day are sorely missing a great-hearted teacher and friend. But it is only a sketch, and does not claim to be more.

Mr Seaver, on the other hand, has attempted the difficult task of assessing the importance of Dr Schweitzer's place in the interpretation of Christianity, and he is not concerned (as his title might suggest) with any account of his life and work. These, indeed, are already familiar to most of us through Dr Schweitzer's own books, and there are few who have not some knowledge of the hospital at Lambarene. What we are given here is an ordered sketch of the philosophy of life which led to the founding of that hospital, based upon a detailed study of Schweitzer's books and illustrated by copious extracts therefrom. The result is a book of very great value, and if I have only space here for criticism it is because I think the book really successful and important and worth the trouble of criticizing.

The most radical comment is that I do not believe that Mr Seaver, or Schweitzer himself, really does justice to traditional orthodoxy. Schweitzer's own defence of his position is well known and need not be discussed here. But Mr Seaver's statement that when the *Quest* was written "few divines would be found outside the Roman Church who would subscribe to the doctrine of the Dual Nature" (p. 9) is simply untrue, though naturally it was the adventurers, like Sanday, who made most stir. And his judgment that the "traditionalist dogmatic theologian" would say of Schweitzer that "such a man by repudiating the commonly accepted creed of Christendom has placed himself outside the pale of the community of Christian believers, and his ethical mysticism springs from humanitarian sentiment rather than

from supernatural grace" (p. 110) is just a travesty of what orthodox theologians do actually say about such teaching and such lives as these.

The book is one for scholars and will repay their study. It would have helped that study if the references had been attached to the numerous quotations from Schweitzer's writings. In fact, I do not know whether some of them—*e.g.*, that in brackets on p. 94—are from those writings at all. And, surely, the German originals and not the English translations should have been given priority in the bibliography.

Oxford. L. W. Grensted.

The Christian Approach to the Moslem: A Historical Study. James Thayer Addison. Columbia University Press, New York; O.U.P. 18s. 6d.

For 1,300 years Islam has constituted a major challenge to Christianity and the Church, and this for several reasons. It is not altogether fanciful to suppose that Muhammad himself, instead of founding a new and rival religion, might have become a great Christian leader, if the Christianity with which he came in touch in his earlier years had not been corrupt. Again, the bulk of the Christian population in most of the countries conquered by his followers went over to the new religion, not generally, as used to be supposed, by forcible conversion, but by their own choice. To many of them Islam seemed to be a better religion than Christianity as they knew it. Indeed, it has always been the claim of Islam that it is the final and perfect religion, superior to all others and intended by God to supersede them. In support of this claim Moslems can point to two noteworthy facts. First, Islam is largely self-propagating. Christians send out professional missionaries and maintain expensive missionary organizations; yet in many lands Moslems with no such machinery have been more successful in spreading their faith. Secondly, Islam itself has proved all but immune to Christian missionary endeavour. Neither fact is due by any means exclusively to the weakness of that endeavour. On the one hand, Islam is a much easier religion to follow and its adoption has usually brought big social and material advantages; on the other, in Moslem lands Christian evangelism has been rigorously restricted, and apostasy from Islam has been visited with dire penalties. Nevertheless it remains true that, apart from the heroic few, the Christian effort to convert Moslems has been woefully inadequate.

Dr Addison's book is divided into three parts. The first gives Twelve Centuries of Background. It is a valuable short account of the subject, and should help to remove several common misconceptions with regard, for instance, to the earlier Moslem treatment of Christian minorities and the relative enlightenment of Moslem civilization at its heyday and that of contemporary Christendom. Part two, which is by far the longest, describes the efforts of Christian missions and the conditions in which they have had to work in the principal Moslem lands during the last 150 years. It is not a story of unrelieved gloom. Results have been meagre, but there has been courageous devotion in

missionaries and converts. Moreover, prospects, notably in Iran, are now rather more hopeful. Perhaps the chief fault of the book is that it says nothing of the work of Roman Catholic missions during the period of non-Roman effort. The general conclusion to be drawn from the whole study would have been more firmly based if it had been shown, as it might have been, that Roman methods have been no more successful than those of the Protestants.

The methods used by the non-Roman missions are noted here and there in the course of the historical survey. They are discussed in part three, which is entitled "Problems and Policies." From the point of view of the modern missionary to Moslems this is the most valuable section of the book. One wishes that it were longer, more developed and constructive, but that would have been outside the scope of the book. What Dr Addison has done, and has done admirably, is to show that, if the Moslem world is to be won for Christ, the Church must vastly increase its efforts, must study afresh the methods of presenting its message to them, and give warmer reality to the reception of converts into the Christian brotherhood.

G. W. Broomfield.

London.

Fossett's Memory. By Christopher Hollis. Hollis and Carter. 9s.

Whereas the fiction of *Death of a Gentleman* was that the letters composing it had actually been written by a non-existent person, the fiction of its sequel is that it is a story. The difference may seem negligible, but is in fact capital. This time Mr Hollis has fallen into that *confusion des genres* so righteously deplored on a memorable occasion by a literary critic who was surely acute within his limits: Napoleon. Anyone may begin—I began myself—to read *Fossett's Memory* in the expectation of experiencing the feelings usually aroused by a novel; and whoever expects this here is going to be disappointed. The means of exciting such feelings are not there. The book is a volume of gossip held together by only the thinnest thread of narrative. The epistolary fiction of *Death of a Gentleman* not being liable so to mislead, *Fossett's Memory* must to that extent be rated inferior to its predecessor.

It is none the less an entertaining book, and once recognized frankly as gossip it is likely to be widely enjoyed. The author has more than one level of wit, as may be judged by contrasting phrases like "Ancestral voices prophesying woe" or "Incest added to injury" with "Egypt was invented to make Swinburne seem funny." And as the wit varies in level, so does the gossip. The passages on cricket smack of *Punch* when *Punch* is being earnest, but when other topics are to the fore it is rather of Critic in the *New Statesman* or of Harold Nicolson in the *Spectator* that the reader is reminded, and now and then, especially in the later pages, Mr Hollis may even be said to rival D. W. in the *Tablet*. If I add that the subjects touched upon range from artificial manure as well as from cricket through English politics, the physical and moral effects of bombing, Virgil and Dante, to Romanism *v.* Anglicanism, and that there is a notable commentary on *Measure for Measure*, it will be seen that Mr Hollis, like Shakespeare, has something for everyone.

He is to be credited furthermore with having rejected the easy way out of a happy ending. True, his narrator, from beginning as a "Left Winger," does end up near the Right (after all, as early as his days at Eton he had begun imbibing *The Divine Comedy*!), yet he is still far from having acquired any genuine odour of sanctity.

The high spot of the book is Section XV (pp. 207-228), in which a Papist is given the third degree by his fiancée, assisted by the not altogether engaging narrator, and he comes across with grounds for belonging to the Roman Church which many will find fresh and some surprising. At this point there is more than a suggestion of character-drawing. Section XV is not to be missed.

Montgomery Belgion.

The Athenæum, S.W.1.

SHORTER NOTICES

The Chaplain in the Factory. By C. H. Cleal. S.C.M. Press. 2s. 6d.

As a description of much of the work that has been and is being done by chaplains of various denominations in the experimental field of modern industry this is a timely book. It shows how war conditions have made possible the opening up of this field and that there will probably be increasing scope after the war in peace time, which will require a carefully selected and trained personnel. More might have been said about the chaplains' contacts with the managers of industry and about the scope of the work that is yet to be tackled.

In view of this likely development there is need for a larger and more theological approach to the subject, dealing with such questions as the Church's aim in the industrial field, how the life of industrial man, as worker, parent and citizen, can be given meaning through the Christian sacraments and ordinances, the dangers of creating a factory brand of "British Christianity," etc. This will inevitably raise theological issues, but these have to be faced and cannot be brushed aside because the field is still in an experimental stage of development. Ultimately it is on the answer to these questions that the chaplain's strategy is based.

I. R. Carrick, O.G.S.

Swynnerton.

The Inadequacy of Non-Christian Religion. Ed. H. A. Evan Hopkins. Inter-Varsity Fellowship. 1s. 6d.

" It is fatally easy to study Comparative Religion from the secluded atmosphere of the library and to trace in one and another of the different faiths shades of truth which have their fulness in Christianity, and to be so obsessed by them that the uniqueness of the supreme Faith is lost. But life in the lands where these faiths are practised, and where their inadequacy to meet man's immemorial needs is evident, drives one to the conclusion that the Christian religion stands alone"

(pp. 74-5). Such is the conviction which has inspired the compilation of this useful little book by working missionaries as an introduction for young recruits. All the chief religions of the world are surveyed one by one, including Modern Judaism, which "is not the religion of the Old Testament" (p. 50), and are contrasted in a long final chapter with Christianity, declared to be "Supreme and Unique." The wide, full and detailed bibliography at the end itself makes the book worth possessing.

THE OFFERING OF NAZARETH. By C. D. Hoste. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d.

This book, the third of a series, is described as a devotional study of the Incarnation in relation to the Communicant Life of the Church of England. In it the author takes the Holy Communion Office of 1662 as it stands, and makes the sincere but not very convincing attempt to see in it, from the Offertory onwards, a point-to-point "re-presentation" of the Lord's Incarnate Life from the Annunciation to Calvary and beyond, in which the devout communicant may share. The Ante-Communion "re-presents" our own Baptism. But even the writer's enthusiasm boggles at the position of the Prayer for the King!

HAIGH. G. E. P. COX.

THE BURIAL OF CHRIST. By Alfred O'Rahilly. Cork University Press. 2s.

Dr O'Rahilly, who is perhaps the most versatile of contemporary Irish scholars, discusses the burial of our Lord in some detail in this pamphlet, which consists of four articles reprinted from the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*. He maintains, in opposition to Père F. M. Braun, O.P., that the evidence of the Gospels does not refute the authenticity of the Holy Shroud of Turin, a question to be settled scientifically. The authenticity of this celebrated relic was accepted by the late Canon T. A. Lacey in his *Historic Christ*. R. P. McD.

THERE IS A TIDE. By Mervyn Stockwood. Allen and Unwin. 6s.

This is a course of lectures on the Apostles' Creed, given by a parish priest to his people. I have read very many explanations of the Christian faith that were intended to be popular, but I do not recall one more effective than this. By "popular" I do not mean that it makes Christianity easy, but that it meets ordinary people where they are. That is doubtless a question-begging commendation, for ordinary people are in many different places and states of mind, and Mr Stockwood's message will not get across to them all equally. He wields a sledge-hammer, not a rapier; he doesn't beat about the bush; he has an "either—or," not a "both—and," sort of mind. His teaching is in the tradition of Stewart Headlam and the Guild of St Matthew, which is to say that it is hot stuff, though not so hot now as it was then. At times he is tendentious, and at times he over-simplifies. But perhaps this is no more than to say that no single mind is capable of appro-

priating or conveying the wealth of meaning in the Creed. For example, Mr Stockwood sees only one side of the truth about eschatology. This is the best attempt I have seen to interpret at the popular level the "realized eschatology" that was the theological vogue a few years ago. It is splendidly done. But the result confirms the suspicion that a big and vital element in the New Testament, and in the Christian understanding of history and of politics, is being ignored. Some readers, for whom these lectures will bring the Christian faith to life, will have stiffer intellectual work ahead of them than they are led to suppose. But they will have received the initial incentive, and that is what is generally lacking at present.

A. R. V.

Our Fellowship in the Gospel. By P. C. A. Carnegy. S.P.C.K. 3s.

Christ the Companion. By Fr Andrew. Mowbrays. 3s. 6d.

The Sufferings of Christ. By Sibyl Harton. Mowbrays. 1s. 9d.

The Canon Missioner of the Wakefield diocese plainly feels deeply the evangelistic responsibility of the Church today, its difficulties and the need for the laity to play its part. His book is addressed to clergy and their more aware lay helpers, to equip them and other lay folk as relevant evangelists. The opening chapters on the prophetic task of the Church and the witness of the laity speak in a good and clear manner from the Scriptures to our present situation. It is when Canon Carnegy goes on to expound the leading themes of the gospel, as related to present needs, that the book lacks clarity and compulsion: the course of the argument is not always clear, and the choice of words in places is such as will convey neither inspiration to the priest nor meaning to the layman. Only when he returns to the Church does the author seem to be at ease in expounding his doctrine, which is sound enough, in clear and concrete terms. As Canon Carnegy rightly points out in his last chapter (which he might have developed profitably), "For the most part the laity are painfully ignorant of even the most familiar theological terms," but with the right presentation of the gospels "they will come to realise that every human problem is in the truest sense theological." The difficulty of this presentation is shown in his own words concerning the Atonement: "We may lack eloquence; that does not matter: the one essential is that we ourselves should be living within the sphere of redemption, and know ourselves to be recipients of God's forgiveness and grace." Certainly it is not eloquence that is needed, but surely some more direct and concrete language than this. The great difficulty today is that the significant New Testament words like redemption are no longer familiar or have any immediate content for common people, as they did for the common people of the first century. What is needed is books which explain the words and experience of the New Testament clearly to lay folk and show them how they reveal the real needs of people today.

Fr Andrew's Lent book contains some helpful material, but many of the meditations are of loose construction, precariously built on a brief

text. It is difficult to find any very clear plan in the course. Mrs Harton's "diurnal of prayer" is carefully and closely woven round the sufferings of our Lord's body. The subject may be too limited for some, but many will find real strengthening and deepening for their prayers here. The material may be used either for vocal or mental prayer, and provides acts, aspirations and intercessions.

CAMBERWELL. J. H. CHURCHILL.

THE FLOWER OF GRASS. By Émile Cammaerts. Cresset Press. 6s.

This is a book of much interest and charm. It is the story of Professor Cammaerts' spiritual pilgrimage, presented in a series of seven essays, each linked to a stage in the journey, and recording a conversion from atheistic humanism to a definitely supernatural Christian faith and the practice of the Christian religion.

Brought up to nature-worship by a mother who was a disciple of Rousseau, turning then, as a student in Brussels, to atheism and anarchism under the influence of the geographer Reclus, he moved slowly and laboriously to the Christian faith by way of medieval art, marriage to a Christian and the "impact of pain." The thread of autobiography strings together the writer's opinions on a wide variety of themes, but they are all relevant to his passage from humanism to Christianity and to the conviction that "most of the mistakes made by human society during the last four hundred years and the disastrous consequences which these mistakes have brought about are due to the fact that man, instead of God, was placed in the centre of the universe."

There is a virile realism and maturity in these well-written essays which makes them very attractive. This Belgian scholar has made a noteworthy contribution to the contemporary presentation of Christianity to English-speaking people by this sincere and modestly told story of his inner life.

ELY. H. BALMFORTH.

The new (1945) edition of *A Christian Year Book* (S.C.M. Press, 3s. 6d.) contains much additional material. This is now becoming well established as a most useful work of reference on ecclesiastical subjects.

The two articles on *Oliver Quick as a Theologian*, which Dr J. K. Mozley contributed to THEOLOGY in January and February, 1945, have been now published separately as a *Theology Reprint* (S.P.C.K., 4d.).

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: Sherwood Eddy, *A Portrait of Jesus* (7s. 6d.).

A.P.C.K. (Dublin): R. P. C. Hanson and B. Harvey, *The Loom of God: An Introduction to the Study of the Bible* (3s. 6d.); R. P. McDermott and D. A. Webb, *Irish Protestantism Today and Tomorrow* (1s. 6d.).

FROM THE AUTHOR, ST. MARY'S, WAVERLEY, N.S.W.: E. Pattison Clarke, *A Text Book for Anglican Confirmation* (n.p.).

BATSFORD: Christina Hole, *Witchcraft in England* (21s.).

BURNS OATES AND WASHBOURNE: J. Leycester King, S.J., *Sex Enlightenment and the Catholic* (6s.).

C.C.M.F.: R. E. Parsons, *Re-educating Adults* (1s. 6d.).

CENTENARY PRESS: Michael Ramsey, *The Resurrection of Christ* (5s.); V. Solovyev, *The Meaning of Love* (5s.).

CHURCH BOOK ROOM PRESS: Bishop of Worcester, *Jeremiah—A Prophet to the Nations*, (3s. 6d.).

C.L.A.: Alfred Dru Drury, C.R., *Psalm cxix arranged with Comment for Purposes of Devotion* (1s.); W. M. Hislop, *The Loyal Churchman* (3d.); W. G. Holmes, *Reincarnation* (3d.); K. C. Thompson, *A Preparation for Confirmation* (1s.); Dorothy Dobson, *The Practice of Prayer* (1s.); E. Kemp, *Reconstruction in the Church of England*; E. D. Merritt, *The Appointment of Bishops*; A Diocesan Bishop, *Diocesan Synods*; S. Eley, *Church Finance* (Church and Realm Series, 6d. each).

CHURCH UNION: *Reservation of the Eucharist: its Purposes and Regulation* (6d.).

JAMES CLARKE: Nicodemus, *Treasures of Darkness* (5s.).

CRAIG AND WILSON: M. P. G. Leonard, *Here is the News* (9d.).

EVANS BROS.: W. H. Maxwell Rennie and L. D. Gibbin, *Our Men Returning* (1s.).

EYRE AND SPOTTISWOODE: K. S. Latourette, *The Unquenchable Light* (7s. 6d.).

FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION: *When We Call: A Devotional Series for Today* (1s.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: Maisie Spens, *Those Things which Cannot be Shaken* (7s. 6d.).

HUTCHINSON: Sir Henry Slesser, *Order and Disorder* (15s.).

KINGSGATE PRESS: E. A. Payne, *The Fellowship of Believers* (3s. 6d.).

LEICESTER DIOCESAN MISSIONARY COUNCIL: Bishop J. J. Willis, *Foundations of Unity* (1s.).

LONGMANS: Archbishop William Temple, *Christianity as an Interpretation of History* (William Ainslie Memorial Lecture) (1s.).

MODERN CHURCHMEN'S UNION: G. W. Butterworth, *Little Talks on Religion*, Nos. 1-10 (2d. each).

MOWBRAYS: Bede Frost, *The Teaching of the Bible* (5s.); H. A. Wilson, *Haggerston Catechism VI* (1s. 9d.).

N.A.B.C.: *Spiritual Well-being through Boys' Clubs* (1s. 3d.).

NATIONAL PEACE COUNCIL: L. P. Jacks, *Peace by Compulsion?*; E. F. Allnutt and G. Leibholz, *Re-educating Germans?*; H. J. Laski, *Will the Peace Last?*; D. Mitrany, *The Road to Security* (6d. each).

NATIONAL SOCIETY AND S.P.C.K.: Dorothy Batho, *The Birth of Judaism* (5s.).

RANDOLPH PRESS (U.S.A.): D. B. Perley, *Whither Christian Missions?* ($1.50).

S.C.M. PRESS: H. T. Kerr, Jr. (Ed.), *A Compend of the Institutes of the Christian Religion by John Calvin*; *A Compend of Luther's Theology* (12s. 6d. each); J. Newsom, *Willingly to School* (2s. 6d.); John Foster, *World Church* (6s.); G. Hoyland, *The Tyranny of Mathematics* (1s. 6d.); A. Victor Murray, *The School and the Church* (3s. 6d.); Arnold S. Nash, *The University and the Modern World* (12s. 6d.); W. A. Visser t' Hooft, *The Struggle of the Dutch Church* (2s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: G. B. Code, *A Cathedral College of Clergy* (3d.); Sir Frederic Kenyon, *Religion and National Life* (1s.); G. D. Barker, *The Education Act, 1944: A General Summary* (2d.); L. E. Elliott-Binns, *The Story of England's Church* (3s. 6d.); W. J. Sexton, *Definite Teaching on our Christian Faith and Practice* (6d.); Bishop of Salisbury, *Village Faith and Village Fellowship* (8d.); M. C. Hale and M. S. Cave, *Yours in the Fight* (2s. 6d.); E. D. Sedding, S.S.J.E. (Ed.), *Godfrey Calloway* (10s. 6d.); W. J. Ferrar, *The Gospel in the Gospel* (3d.); H. E. Crewdson, *On Reading in Church* (9d.); F. C. Hamlyn, *Seed-time and Harvest:* Prayers for the use of farmers, etc. (8d.).

TRAFTON PUBLISHING CO., LEXINGTON, U.S.A.: Felix L. Cirlot, *Christ and Divorce* (n.p.).

TYNDALE PRESS: F. F. Bruce, *The Speeches in Acts* (2s. 6d.); B. F. C. Atkinson, *The Theology of Prepositions* (2s. 6d.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher